

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/  
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/  
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/  
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/  
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from:/  
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/  
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title page of issue/  
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/  
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/  
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments:/  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

Wrinkled pages may film slightly out of focus.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
									✓		

# The Catholic.

Quod semper; quod ubique; quod ab omnibus.

VOL. I.

KINGSTON, FRIDAY, AUGUST 19, 1831.

NO. 44.

## SELECTED.

### AMICABLE DISCUSSION.

Continued.

#### LETTER VII.

##### THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION.

###### TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

We have shown, against the reformed Zuinglians, Calvinists or Anglicans, that a figurative sense cannot be given to the words, *this is my body*. We are now going to shew against the Lutherans, that the literal sense that must there be admitted, and which they admit with us, necessarily conducs to the dogma of transubstantiation. This word, which is not in scripture, but which the Church has adopted to give its doctrine with more precision, expresses the change of the substance of bread into the substance of the body of Jesus Christ. Now the literal sense most necessarily supposes this change. In fact, what our Saviour blesses and distributes to his apostles, he assures them, when giving it to them, that it is his body. Before, it was visibly bread and nothing else; actually, after his assertion, it is his body. There has, therefore, a change taken place; for no substance whatever can at one and the same time remain what it is, and become another, because then it would be and would not be itself at the same time: it would be itself, having remained what it was: it would not be itself, having become something else, which is evidently absurd.

Will it be said, with Luther, that the bread having undergone no change, the body is come to be joined; or united to it? In that case, the words of our Saviour are changed; and his proposition amounts to one or other of these two, *this is at once bread and my body*, or *this bread is also my body*. The literal sense of the words is manifestly abandoned by explaining them in this manner, or rather the words are not explained at all, but others are substituted in their place. Who in fact does not see that, *this is my body*, and *this bread is also my body*, are two different propositions? Moreover this latter is in every respect opposed to the grammatical expression of the phrase. Our Saviour did not say, *this bread*, but *this*, employing an indefinite term, a demonstrative neuter pronoun which interpreters render by *hoc*. Now the neuter pronoun cannot refer to bread, which is of another gender; it must then refer to the body, or be taken in general to denote indistinctly the object that our Saviour was holding in his hand; and then the literal sense is *this*, that is to say, what

I hold in my hand, is my body, but in no wise *this bread is my body*. The rules of grammar could not permit it, neither does good sense admit of it: for bread, remaining such, cannot be the body: it is one or other, but not both, one and the other at once: there is therefore necessarily a change of the bread into the body, that these words, *this is my body*, may be found true to the letter. Again, the words of institution are explicit on the subject: "He took bread, says St. Paul, and giving thanks broke and said: *Take ye and eat, this is my body, which shall be delivered for you*; and St. Matthew; "Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the new Testament which shall be shed for you." Jesus Christ gives to his apostles the body which was going to be delivered, the blood, which was going to be shed: and most certainly there was no mixture of bread in the body that was going to be delivered.

The Calvinists have perceived this as well as ourselves. They have felt the necessity of a change in the bread: but this change, according to them is not real, it is only moral. For them, from ordinary aliment, the bread becomes the figure of the body, and the words signify, *this is the figure of my body*. This opinion is absolutely inadmissible, as we have proved in the first part; and the Lutherans join with us in shewing them that they must absolutely adhere to the literal sense. In their turn the Calvinists here unite with us against the Lutherans, and demonstrate to them that their defending the literal sense must lead them to transubstantiation, and to acknowledge that dogma of the Catholic Church. As they borrow from her the arguments they employ against the Lutherans on this question, I will press them into my service for the purpose of laying those arguments before you. Our proofs may perhaps appear stronger to you when coming from their mouths. At least, by bringing them on the stage one after another, you will find it more singular and striking to hear the Calvinists prove to the Lutherans the Catholic dogma.

Let us produce first the great enemy of the real presence. Zuinglius speaks out plainly upon this point in his reply to Billicanus: "Certainly (says he) if we take the word *is* in its literal signification, those who follow the Pope are right, and we must believe that the bread is flesh." That is to say, according to Zuinglius, the simple and literal sense of these words, *this is my body*, necessarily includes transubstantiation. He has recourse to the same argument in his treatise on the Lord's Supper, "If we explain without figure the

word *is*, in the sentence *this is my body*, it is impossible that the substance of bread should not be changed into the substance of the body of Jesus Christ, and that, thus, what before was bread is no longer bread. *Fieri nequit given panis substantia in ipsam carnis substantiam convertatur. Panis ergo amplius non est, qui antea panis erat.*" He expresses himself moreover in the same manner, in a work against Luther: "If the word *this* marks the bread, and no figure can be tolerated in these words, it follows that the bread becomes the body of Jesus Christ, and that what was bread, on a sudden is made the body of Jesus Christ. *Panis transit in corpus Christi, et est corpus subito, quod jam panis erat.*" He had said to him a little before: "If you obstinately persist in not receiving the figure, it follows that the Pope is right in saying that the bread is changed into the body of Jesus Christ."

Beza maintains against the Lutherans in the conference of Monbelliard, that of the two explanations which confine themselves to the literal sense "that of the catholics departs less from the words of institution, if they are to be expounded word for word." And he proves it thus: "The advocates for transubstantiation say, that, by virtue of these divine words, what before was bread, having changed its substance, becomes instantly the very body of Jesus Christ, in order that the proposition *this is my body* may thus be correct: whereas the exposition of the advocates for consubstantiation saying that the words *this is my body*, signify my body is essentially, within, with, or under this bread, does not declare what the bread is become, nor what it is that is the body, but merely where the body is." This proof is striking and decisive. For Jesus Christ, when he says *this is my body*, declares that such an object is his body, whereas in Luther's explanation he declares where his body is, within, with, or under the bread; but in no wise what his body is. "It is clear (observes Bossuet on this passage) that Jesus Christ having taken bread to make something of it, was bound to declare to us what it was he wished to make it: and it is not less evident that this bread became what the Almighty wished it to be made. Now these words shew that he wished to make it his body: in whatever manner it may be understood; because he said *this is my body*. If then this bread did not become his body in figure, it became so in effect: and we must necessarily admit either the change in figure or the change in substance. Thus, by merely attending with simplicity to the word of Jesus Christ, we must pass to the doctrine of the

Church; and Beza is right in saying that it has fewer inconveniencies, as far as relates to the manner of speaking, than that of the Lutherans, that is, the literal sense is better preserved by it."

Hospinian every where makes the same acknowledgement, as when he says, in refuting a work of Luther's: "If we must exclude all figure from the words of Jesus Christ, the opinion of those who follow the Pope is correct." The same author, as well as other defenders of the figurative sense, remark with much correctness against Luther, that Jesus Christ did not say *my body is here, or my body is under this and with this*; or, *this contains my body*; but simply, *this is my body*. Whence it follows that he in no wise wished to give his disciples a substance which contains or accompanies his body, but his body without mixture of any foreign substance.

Calvin frequently insists upon this same truth; but not to dwell too long upon particular authorities let us listen to an entire synod of Zuinglians: that of Czeuger in Poland, related in the Geneva collection. This synod demonstrates that the consubstantiation of the Lutherans is indefensible, "because, says the synod, as the rod of Moses could not have become a serpent without transubstantiation, and as the water was not blood in Egypt, nor wine at the marriage feast of Cana without a change: so in like manner the bread of the Lord's Supper cannot be substantially the body of Jesus Christ if not changed into his flesh, by losing the form and the substance of bread." Let us say with Bossuet, that good sense dictated this decision. In fact, the bread remaining such, can no more be the body of our Saviour, than the rod, remaining a rod, could be a serpent, or that the water remaining water could be blood in Egypt, and wine at the marriage-feast of Cana.

Moreover, it is worthy of remark, that in spite of the bitterness and vehemence of Luther and his followers against transubstantiation, they did not entertain so terrible an idea of it in the beginning. The simplicity of the words, which has always induced them to preserve, the dogma of the real presence, for a long time kept them in the belief of the change of substance.

Luther commenced by teaching it most positively in the following terms; "Every action of Christ is an instruction for us, as he himself has told us: I have given you an example that as I have done, so do you also. Do this in commemoration of me, said he. What is the meaning of do this? Is it not what I have just been doing, with you? But what does he do? he takes bread and by this word, *this is my body* he changes it into his body, and gives it to his disciples to eat." But soon after Luther changes his own doctrine, and proposes another quite different, still however leaving his followers to adopt which of the two they pleased.

"I permit, says he, that each one may hold which opinion he pleases.—Let each one know that he is free, without endangering his salvation.

to embrace which of the two he pleases." He had so little aversion to the catholic belief upon the change of the substance, that he himself declares that his only reason for rejecting it was because he was so much pressed to receive it. He was even content that it should be inserted and clearly drawn out by Melancton first in the confession of Augsburgh, and then in the apology.

Here is a literal translation of the 10th article of the Confession, such as it was presented to the Diet. "Concerning the Lord's supper, we teach that the true body and blood of Jesus Christ are truly present under the species of bread and wine: that they are distributed and received: for this reason we condemn the opposite doctrine."

A year after this authentic confession had been presented at Augsburgh, Melancton found himself obliged to write a defence of it, which was equally approved and signed by all the Lutheran states. In it he still more clearly establishes the change of the substance, in these words; "We find that not only the Roman Church maintains the corporal presence of Jesus Christ, but that the Greek Church also maintains it at the present day, and has maintained it in ancient times. This we may discover from their canon of the mass, in which the Priest publicly prays that the bread may be changed and may become the body of Jesus Christ. And Vulgarius, an esteemed author, clearly says that the bread is not a figure only, but that it is changed into flesh." These two passages extracted from two acts, solemnly approved of by all the party, evidently shew that the Lutherans, commenced by admitting transubstantiation in expressions, and even by going so far as to condemn the contrary doctrine. We know that Melancton was then seeking to draw the principles of reform near to those of the church, and to present to the deist as much conformity as possible between the two. Perhaps people may now feel disposed to call in question the authenticity of these two passages: I grant that the first was notably altered, ten years after the first edition of the Confession of faith, and that the second has been totally retrenched in later editions of the Apology. It will therefore be necessary to say a few words by way of establishing the authenticity of them both.

1° Count de Kollonitch bishop of Winstadt, reprinted three German copies of the Confession of Augsburgh, taken from the imperial library at Vienna. These three copies, although printed at different times, and differing in many parts, are word for word the same upon the 10th article, of which I have given the literal translation.

2° The conformity of this compilation with the passage in the defence renders its authenticity more probable, if it be true that the passage of the defence is itself authentic: and we shall see lower down that the Lutherans grant it to be so.

3° It is certain from Sleiden and Melancton, as well as from Chytræus and Celestine in their histories of the confession of Augsburgh that the catholics made no objection to the 10th article, in their refutation of the confession, produced by order of Charles V. Now it is not less certain that they

would have opposed it, if instead of the articles mentioned above, most conformable to our dogma they had discovered the one so contradictory, that was afterwards substituted in these words "That in the Lord's Supper the body and the blood of Jesus Christ are given to us with the bread and wine."

4° Hospinian, a celebrated minister, maintains that this confession must be the original, because it is the one found in the edition of 1530, published at Wittenberg, the cradle of Lutheranism, and the usual abode of Luther and Melancton. He says that the article was afterwards changed, on account of its favouring transubstantiation too much, by specifying that the body and blood are received, not with the substance, but under the species of the bread and wine. Schlussenburg, a Lutheran writer makes no difficulty of accusing Melancton himself of having changed his 10th article of the confession, from the leaning he afterwards discovered towards the opinion of the reformers.

As for the passage from the Apology, it was so intimately connected with that of the confession, that it could no longer subsist after the essential alteration which the other had undergone. Consequently they got a new edition of the Apology to be published by the same printer, and instead of taking the pains to change the article, they suppressed it entirely. The discovery of this fraud produced many complaints, to which it was coldly replied that the article was not worth preserving. Heshusius disapproved of conduct so dishonest, and declared that he would have preferred to have had the error publicly confuted, rather than have given occasion to most unfavourable impressions, by suppressing it with secrecy and fraud,

Grotius, who so well understood the spirit of Protestantism, expresses himself as follows: "It is incontestable that according to the Fathers, and a great number of Protestants, with the signs is presented to us the thing itself (in the Eucharist), but in a manner imperceptible to our senses. Thus taught Bucer and others. . . . . To speak my sentiments on the subject I think that all our great disputants understand perfectly well what the ancient Church teaches, and what the Greek and Latin Churches still teach: but they pretend to know nothing of it; that they may have subject for declamation before those who are led more by the senses of the body than by those of the mind."

Molanus, the learned Abbe of Lökkum, in the project for the reunion of the Catholics and Protestants of the confession of Augsburgh, speaks in the manner following: "Drejerus, Professor at Königsberg, admits here, in a certain sense a substantial change. I would not vouch for this doctrine; but I should think that I said nothing contrary to the analogy of faith, by supposing that by the words of institution, there is produced in the Lord's Supper, or in the consecration a certain mysterious change, in which is verified, in an undiscoverable manner, this proposition so common in the Fathers, *the bread is the body of Jesus Christ*. The catholics must then be entreated, without entering upon the question of the manner in which the change of the bread and wine in the Eucharist

is effected, to be satisfied with saying with us (and assuredly they would be satisfied with it) that this manner is incomprehensible and inexplicable: and yet such, as that by a secret and admirable change of the bread it becomes the body of Jesus Christ: and we must also entreat the Protestants, to whom that might appear a novelty, to make no scruple in saying, after the example of the first reformers, that the bread is the body of Jesus Christ, and the wine his blood, because these propositions were formerly so universal that scarcely can an ancient writer be found who has not made use of them."

The same pious and learned Abbe expresses himself elsewhere in these terms: "I say that the body of Jesus Christ is precisely and substantially the same upon the altar, as in heaven and upon the cross, but that it is there in a different manner. It was on the cross in a natural and bloody manner; it is in heaven in a visible and glorious manner; whereas on the altar it is in an invisible, unbloody and accessible manner: but it is always the same only. I acknowledge therefore with the Fathers of the eastern and western churches, the real change operated in the Eucharist, expressed by the words transmutation, transelementation, transubstantiation; which signifies that after the words of our Saviour have been pronounced, there is found truly on the altar, by virtue of the union with the sensible species, what was not there before, & mean the person of Jesus Christ."

Such is the explanation given by a profound theologian attached to the confession of Augsburg who had no intention of giving offence on the subject of the Eucharist. He thought, and with great reason according to what we have brought forward that the change of the substance accorded with the ancient principles of Lutheranism laid down at the diet in the solemn confession of its belief. Would to God that those who at the present day belong to the same communion would regulate their sentiments according to the same principles with the learned and virtuous Molanus! We might then entertain greater hopes of the union so much to be desired by the upright and well disposed of both parties.

In addition to these favorable sentiments of the Lutherans and Calvinists, we have some testimonies of your own countrymen in our favor. Bishop Forbes acknowledges the possibility of transubstantiation in the following terms; "There is too much temerity and danger in the assertion of many Protestants who refuse to God the power of transubstantiating bread into the body of Christ. Every one allows it is true, that what implies contradiction cannot be done. But as no individual person knows with certainty the essence of each thing, and in consequence what does or does not imply contradiction it is an evident temerity for any one whomsoever to place bounds to the power of God. I approve of the opinion of the theologians of Wittemburg, who are not afraid to avow that God has power to change the bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ."

Thornike allows of the change, and tells us in plain terms that "the elements are really changed

from ordinary bread and wine, into the body of Jesus Christ, mysteriously present, as in a sacrament; and this by virtue of the consecration, and in no wise by the faith of the receiver."

Bishop Montague declares that the change is produced by the consecration of the elements. In support of this assertion, he cites passages from St. Cyril of Jerusalem, from the liturgy of St. Basil, from St. Cyprian and St. Ambrose: he renders the expressions employed by these Fathers, by the words *transmutation* and *transelementation*. Still after having confessed the change produced by the consecration, after asserting that it was recognized by the primitive Church, he changes sides and concludes by declaring against transubstantiation.\*

Samuel Parker, bishop of Oxford, defends and proves it, as follows: "In the first place then it is evident to all men, that are but ordinarily conversant in ecclesiastical learning, that the ancient Fathers, from age to age asserted the *real and substantial* presence in very high and expressive terms. The Greeks styled it, *ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ, ΜΕΤΑΡΡΗΘΗΙΣΙΣ, ΜΕΤΑΣΚΕΥΑΣΜΟΣ, ΜΕΤΑΠΟΙΗΣΙΣ, ΜΕΤΑΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΩΣΙΣ*. And the Latines agreeable with the Greeks, *Conversion, Transmutation, Transformation, Transfiguration, Transelementation*, and at length *Transubstantiation*: By all which they expressed nothing more nor less than the *real and substantial Presence* in the Eucharist." The Bishop of Oxford was well aware that transubstantiation not only supposes the real presence but is actually the foundation of it, since, by virtue of the words, the substance of the body of Jesus Christ could not be found in the Eucharist, unless it had taken the place of the substance of the bread. Thus far proceeded the old Church of England, which as it was banished, so it was restored with the crown. But by the reason of the interval of twenty years between the rebellion and restitution there arose a new generation of divines that *knew not Joseph*. . . . . In short, . . . . . if they own a *real Presence*, we see from the premises how little the controversie is between that and *Transubstantiation*, as it is truly and ingeniously understood by *all the reformed Churches*. If they do not, they disown the doctrine both of the Church of England and the Church Catholic, and then if they own only a *figurative Presence* (and it is plain they own no other) they stand condemned of Heresie by almost all the Churches in the christian world: and if this be the thing pretended to be set up (as it certainly is by the authors and contrivers of it) by renouncing *Transubstantiation*, then the result and bottom of the law is under this pretence to bring a new *Heresie by law* into the Church of England."

You see, Sir, that if the doctrine of the real presence has found in your country a great number of defenders, that of transubstantiation has also had

\*From all appearance he would have returned to it. This learned man thought almost in every thing with the Catholic Church, to which, it is said, he would have united himself, if his death which happened in 1641, had not prevented him from executing this resolution. Four years later, the same cause unfortunately upset the same project of a character still more celebrated for his learning and genius. Grotius, on quitting Paris, confided to his learned and worthy friend M. Bignon, that on his return from Sweden, where he was going to settle his affairs, he would give himself exclusively up to the affair of his salvation, and would unite himself to the Catholic Church. He was returning and had already reached Rostock, when he was seized with a sickness which deprived him of life, the Church of a valuable conquest, and the world of a memorable example. The fact is positively asserted by M. Arquand, who had it from M. Bignon himself. "We know that Father Petrus, upon hearing of his death, celebrated mass for the repose of his soul."

its distinguished advocates. You have seen them among the Lutherans, who in general are now become its declared enemies; moreover, (what indeed you yourself must be convinced of even at the present day, the persons most attached to the confession of Augsburg and to their first reformer may still, without injury to their principles, enter completely into the catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, after the example of the pious and learned Hilarian, the Abbe of Lokkum. You have heard the Lutherans prove with us to the Calvinists that it was impossible to admit the figurative sense, and not hold to the literal sense, and the Calvinists joining us afterwards, in proving like us to the Lutherans that the literal sense ought no less necessarily to conduct them to the change of the substance. Thus you have seen them alternately ranged under the catholic standard, victoriously attacking one another with the arms they borrowed from us and the Church triumphing in turns from the blows and the defeats they mutually inflicted upon each other.

I will here spare you the detail of the grammatical cavils invented by the Calvinists to authorize the figurative sense against the change of substance. I know what hickering they have borrowed from the rules of grammar which have been as incorrectly forged as applied by them to each of the words *this is my body*. I know also that they are not worth the trouble of being refuted, after having been so completely refuted by M. Nicole, with that depth, correctness and clearness which distinguish that great controvertist. They easily vanish when brought in contact with the examples, of which the holy scripture furnishes us with the idea & the subject. Could not Moses have said: *This rod is a serpent, this water is blood*? Could not Jesus Christ, at the marriage feast at Cana, have equally said: *This water is wine*? and when rising to life Lazarus or the only son of the widow of Naim, *this dead person is living*? Would not all these propositions have been true to the letter in spite of the pretended rules of grammar? and would the reformed ever succeed in demonstrating to us their incorrectness by saying that if it is a rod, it is not really a serpent; if it is water, it is not really blood or wine? if they are dead they are not in reality living? Why persist obstinately in not seeing, and not acknowledging that in the mouth of God, or by his order these propositions operate what they declare? The Almighty commands, and nature instantly obeys:—Jesus Christ commands, and the grave gives back its prey, and death releases its victim: He speaks, and the water has changed its substance into that of wine, and the bread its substance into that of his body.

But if instead of the bread which we perceive, it is the substance of the body that we must believe, our senses will have deceived us, you will say, and their testimony, on which reposes the certainty of the facts in the Gospel, will then be shaken. No Sir, our senses do not deceive us here, for they do not pronounce sentence, they simply report; and their report is true in the Eucharist. They tell us that they there find the taste, the colour, the appearance of bread, all which is there in effect. It is the mind which, from the report of the senses, judges and pronounces: at the sight of the species it would naturally and with reason conclude, that the substance of bread is also, there; if on this particular occasion, it had not been admonished to check its natural propensity and to reform its judgment. After the instructions of Jesus Christ, the apostles must have judged, and all of us after them not from what they saw, but from what they had heard. This is the exception, it is the only one. Except in this instance, and whenever there is no reason from distance or malady for mistrusting our senses, we ought confidently to rely upon them, remembering that our Saviour has himself appeared to them in testimony of his resurrection. "See

my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see: for a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see me to have."

It is high time to bring this long discussion to a conclusion. In concluding it, I entreat the adversaries of the real presence and of the change of the substance, candidly and conscientiously to say, whether it be the text of scripture that induces them to deny either of these dogmas; whether, on the contrary, putting aside every other consideration, the text does not of itself naturally conduct them to it: whether they do not stand in need of exertion or violence to turn it from the proper to the figurative sense: whether they have not, with a view to sanction their supposed metaphor, been obliged to bring all the Bible into requisition, for the purpose of extracting a few examples, which, after all, do not agree with the case in question, and can neither warrant them to take the figurative sense nor save them from the natural energy of the words. They must allow, I am intimately persuaded, they must acknowledge that their repugnance to receive the text in its simplicity proceeds solely from the philosophical consequences it brings after it, which frighten reason: a body existing in many places at the same time! the body which suffered, which is in heaven, reduced to so small a space in the Eucharistic bread and wine, according to all appearance, and no such thing in reality! who can persuade himself of this? who can believe it? This is the ground of their infidelity, this is the scandal that determines them against each of these mysteries; it is better they think, to resist the Scriptures, better to turn aside the sense of the words of Jesus Christ, than to admit the sense, which they present with all its consequences.

For my part, to act with the candour and good faith I wish to see in them, I frankly admit these consequences. I allow that they are impenetrable, and not less alarming to human comprehension: they are so, it is true. But is it less true that Jesus Christ promised that he would give us his flesh to eat, the same flesh that he would deliver for the life of the world, and that this flesh would be meat indeed? Is it less true that in executing his promise, and presenting the object he held in his hand, he said: *Take, eat, this is my body?* Is it less true that he had the power to operate what he asserted, and much beyond what we can understand? Is it less true that he could not wish to mislead us by fallacious expressions, being essentially truth itself; that with a word he could have made us understand the figure, if he had not wished us to understand the reality; that his goodness and his justice obliged him to do it, since he knew the disputes, the animosities, and the horrible schism, which the cause of this reality would one day occasion in the Church? Is it less true that it is much more sure and reasonable to mistrust ourselves than him: to believe in simplicity what he has said to us in so simple a manner than to heap up difficulties, for which, after all, we are no ways responsible? Is it not wiser to turn away our eyes from them and to fix them upon him who has spoken? We are guilty if we do not hear and believe him, but we cannot be guilty if we do not understand the whole extent of his discourse: for he is as infinite in his intelligence as we are circumscribed in ours. He has made known to us his intention and his will by all that language possesses the most simple, most consistent, and intelligible, so that we cannot be mistaken as to the natural and proper sense which the words present; all the parts agree together, is within the reach of all men to judge of them. What is not within their reach, and what never can be so here below, is the following up of the consequences that result from it, explaining the manner in which this reality of the presence is effected, and comprehending by what invisible cause and secret this change of substance is operated.

But where has it been learned that we have a right to reject what is easily conceived, because in its train follow obscurities which we cannot penetrate? Wherefore do we obstinately resist what surpasses our comprehension, and close our eyes to what strikes us? Why do we wish to give an account to ourselves of that which we know to be impenetrable to our ideas? Let us not foolishly seek to overleap the boundaries by which we are circumscribed. Let us hold fast to our Saviour: let us rest firmly on his word; and he assured that the appearances of contradiction and impossibilities which confound us now that we see through the veil and the cloud, will vanish from our eyes, the instant we shall contemplate the objects by the light of celestial splendour. Let us wait: we shall, each of us, soon be there: the longest life is very short.

To be continued.

A beautiful specimen of Baptist holiness, taken from the Catholic Press.

"The people of Mulhausen," writes the Rev. Mr. Bell, "respected Muncer as a prophet, divinely commissioned to free them from oppression. They expelled their magistrates, declared all property to be common stock, and proclaimed Muncer judge of Israel. This new Samuel wrote to the sovereigns and various states of Europe, to notify to them that the time was now come when a final period should be put to the oppression of the people and the tyranny of kings: and that God had commanded him to exterminate the whole race of tyrants, and to establish over the people men of virtue and real merit. The flame of sedition quickly spread over the greatest part of Germany; and Muncer soon found himself at the head of a formidable army; whole districts suddenly rising in rebellion and flying to his standard. The disorders committed by this religious banditti, alarmed the princes of the neighboring states, and forced them to take the field. At their head was the Landgrave of Hesse, who fell upon Muncer before he could be joined by the several bodies of insurgents on their march to reinforce him. Muncer was discomfited; and more than seven thousand Anabaptists perished on this occasion. Their fanatic leader was himself taken, and a short time after executed. (See Catrou, Hist. des Anab. Sleidan, l. 10, Seckendorf Comment. Hist. &c.) The defeat and death of Muncer did not extinguish Anabaptism in Germany: the party, indeed, was no longer formidable; although it seemed even to increase in numbers. Its sectaries, odious alike to Catholics, to Protestants, and Sacramentarians, were persecuted and defamed throughout the German territories. In Switzerland, the Low countries, and in Holland, they were treated with still greater rigor; numbers were put to death, and the prisons were crowded with these poor deluded people. Their enthusiasm, however, could not be subdued by terror: and they still continued to increase. From time to time, there appeared among them impostors who promised them more happy times. Matthewson, a baker at Haerlem, sent ten apostles into Friesland, to Munster and other places. At Munster there were already some Anabaptist proselytes, who received the new apostles as emissaries from heaven. They all assembled

together in a body at night; and Matthewson's vice-deputy conferred upon them the apostolic spirit which they were eagerly waiting to receive. They appeared not much in public, till their numbers were greatly augmented; when they suddenly ran up and down the country exclaiming: *Repent ye, and do penance and be baptized, that the wrath of God may not fall upon you.* The spirit of fanaticism was quickly diffused; and when the magistrates set forth an ordinance against them, the Anabaptists flew to arms, and seized upon the market place: the townsmen took their post in another quarter of the city. Thus they guarded each other during three days; till they at length agreed to lay down their arms, and that both parties should mutually tolerate each other, notwithstanding their difference of sentiments in matters of religion.

"Meanwhile the Anabaptists dispatched secret messages to different parts, informing by letter their adherents, that a prophet inspired by the holy spirit was come to Munster; that he predicted marvellous events, and instructed men in the true method of saving their souls. In consequence of this intelligence, a prodigious number of Anabaptists repaired to Munster; upon which several of the party ran up and down the streets, crying out with all their might: *Retire all ye wicked from this place, if you wish to escape entire destruction: all those who refuse to be rebaptized will be knocked on the head.* The clergy and the natives then abandoned the town; and the Anabaptists pillaged the churches and forsaken houses; and committed to the flames all books indiscriminately, except the bible. Soon after the town was besieged; and Matthewson, sallying out upon the assailants, was himself numbered among the slain. His death was a thunderbolt to the party: till John Becold revived their drooping spirits by running naked through the streets, and crying out: *the king of Sion is at hand.* After this extraordinary frolic, he retired to his lodgings, and dressed himself as ordinary; but stirred not out of doors. The next morning the people attended in crowds to learn the cause of so mysterious a proceeding. John Becold answered not a word; but signified in writing, that God had enjoined him silence for three days. The term of his mutism was expected with impatience; and then with a prophetic tone he declared to the people, that God had commanded him to establish twelve judges over Israel. He named them, and introduced in the government of Munster whatever alterations he thought fit. When the impostor deemed himself sufficiently secure of the good opinion of the multitude, a certain goldsmith presented himself before the judges, and said to them: 'Hear what the Lord God eternal saith. As heretofore I established Saul king of Israel, and after him David, although he was but a simple shepherd; so I this day establish my prophet Becold, king of Sion.' Another prophet stepped forth and presented him with a sword, saying: 'God establish thee king, not of Sion only, but of all the earth.' The credulous people, in transports of joy, proclaimed the new king of Sion, and caused a crown of gold to be made for the

occasion, and money to be coined in his name.

Without loss of time, Beccold dispatched twenty-six apostles to their various destinations, with commission every where to propagate his empire. Confusion and disorder marked the progress of these new missionaries, particularly in Holland, where John of Leyden pretended that God had made him present of Amsterdam, and of several other cities. Here the Anabaptists, after exciting much tumult and sedition, were many of them punished with death. The king of Sion learnt with extreme concern the deplorable mischances of his apostles. All was now despondency in Munster; the town was taken, and king Beccold himself was put to an ignominious and cruel death. Thus terminated the reign of Anabaptism at Munster, in the year 1536."

Among other notions imbibed by these Scripture renders, it was held by them, that all those who were not re-baptized **MUST BE IMMEDIATELY SLAIN!** A very moderate mode of propagating the truth, and by no means partaking of the spirit of persecution. They also believed all books but the bible useless, and accordingly they burned all they could meet with, to shew their great love for learning and the sciences. *The Martyrology* tells us that John of Leyden declared.

"That a man should not be tied to one wife, but might marry as many as he pleased. Some scrupling to approve of this doctrine, he summoned to appear before the twelve governors, where he swore upon the evangelists, that this doctrine had been revealed to him from Heaven; and to testify the evidence of the spirit, he commanded some of the opposers to be beheaded. Immediately his preachers confirmed this doctrine; but the greatest confirmation was the prophet's practice, who presently married three wives, and never gave over till he had made them up fifteen. Many followed his example and it was looked upon as honourable to have many wives: nay so eager were those holy brothers that as soon as the revelation was made public, they all ran after the handsomest women, lying with them beforehand, without any matrimonial contract, for fear of being disappointed."

We publish with pleasure the following article on the late literary exhibition at Emmetsburgh College; which redounds so much to the credit of an establishment so calumniated and cried down by the *Philadelphian*; and by his echo here, the *Canadian Watchman*.

## EMMETTSBURGH COLLEGE

COMMENCEMENT AT MOUNT ST. MARY'S.  
Emmetsburgh June 30, 1831.

This was a proud day for Mount St. Mary's College. I almost envied the learned president and professors, the merited gratification which they must have felt. Here was proof, convincing proof, that the toils of their scholastic year had not been spent in vain.

From an early hour in the morning the College Halls were opened, and I was surprised to find them thronged with such a number of visitors from

different and distant places—not only from the adjacent villages, Gyltesburg, Frederick, Hagers-town, and Chambersburgh, but also Baltimore, Washington & Philadelphia. This fact is a tribute to the merit and increasing celebrity of this institution. The presence of so many respectable witnesses thus drawn together from different points, to behold the students crowned with academic honours and proving their title to them, must have a happy influence on their youthful minds. We were first introduced into the rooms in which the writings, maps, paintings &c. were exhibited. A single glance round was sufficient to convince me what genius existed here, that a taste for the fine arts was encouraged and that it was directed by able instructors. The chief object of attraction was a copy of a large engraving of West's celebrated painting of Christ healing the sick. The young gentleman who made the copy, Joseph Précios had been extremely successful in preserving all the characteristics of the original. He was honoured with the highest premium of his department: but the admiration of all, and the astonishment of many who gazed with delight on these first fruits of his pencil, must have made the honour doubly gratifying.

At one o'clock a small balloon was let off by a group of busy students, who seemed quite delighted with this mode of rendering science subservient to amusement. It ascended beautifully following a south west direction, until it disappeared over the Blue Mountain.

At this moment we were admitted into the College Hall to witness the still more interesting scenes and ceremonies of the day. An elevated platform was occupied by the Rev. President and faculty. On either side were successive rows of seats filled with interesting youths, whose countenances seemed beaming with hope of honourable distinction. Immediately below was an enclosure reserved for the Orchestra, which was occupied exclusively by the amateurs of music among the students; and the remaining space presented such an array of beauty and respectability as nothing but the scene we had come to witness, could have assembled in this retired spot. After some very impressive prefatory remarks, the Rev. D. Purcell President, distributed the premiums, and at the close of this cheering spectacle, addressed in the Latin Language the candidates for degrees, & then proceeded to confer them on them. The degree of Bachelor of arts, was conferred on Francis Higgins, of Norfolk, and that of Master of arts on Edward Purcell of Lancaster, Pa. William Owings of St. Louis, Missouri, Mr. John Mc. Closky, of New York, Rev. John Hughes, of Philadelphia, and Rev. Peter Schrieber, of Richmond, Va. Several addresses were then delivered by the graduates and the students.—The first a Latin ode to the Patriot Polish army, was a very creditable specimen of classic composition. The fire and feeling of the young speaker may have disarmed my criticism, but he certainly gave expression to noble sentiments in strong and flowing language; and a compliment is due to his very distinct utterance which enabled the Latin scholar to follow him

with delight through this spirited appeal to patriotism. Composition in the classic languages, especially poetical composition, is so rare an attainment in this country, that my pleasure was greatly enhanced by hearing likewise Greek Saphic verse. I know that some men of education are opposed to the great expenditure of time and labour necessary to acquire facility in the versification of these languages; but I also know that classic literature will not flourish unless an enthusiastic admiration of its beauties shall lead us to devote the time and labour necessary to understand them thoroughly and imitate them with facility.

The second speaker recited, very happily, an original translation of the passage in the first book of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, which describes the character of Pompey and Cæsar, and the crossing of the Rubicon. I had read the version of Rowe, and can affirm without the least hesitation that this was far superior to it—more spirited, and more true to the original. We were afterwards entertained for twenty minutes with an interesting speech on Poland. The orator, William Hill, of Marlborough, Md., evinced considerable knowledge of Polish and European history, and spoke in a strain of feeling, which, to repeat his own words, "found an echo in every surrounding breast." An eulogium on the French language, pronounced in French, by an American youth, who charmed the audience by the naïvete of his boasting, and the beauty of his pronunciation,—was succeeded by a poem on the fall of Zahara. The facts, and some of the description of the poem were evidently copied from Washington Irving's *Chronicle of the conquest of Granada*; but our illustrious countryman himself could not have been displeased with the use that was made of his pages.

Materiam superabat opus.

Francis Sumpter, of South Carolina, came forward as the champion of ancient chivalry. For one half hour and more I listened with increasing delight (and my feelings were those of the whole assembly,) to this flow of bright thoughts, splendid figures, clear description, lucid arguments, and glowing appeal to the feelings. But when at the close of his discourse he maintained that although the "forms of ancient chivalry had disappeared, its spirit was still inextinguishable among us."—When he adverted to the heroism of our revolutionary patriot, and to the gallant exploits of our young nation on land, on lake, on ocean, we were all borne irresistibly along by the tide of his enthusiasm. There was nothing of the school-boy in his language or delivery; and although it is generally no mark of wisdom to form prognostics of future eminence from displays of this nature, yet I will venture to predict, that, when time shall have chastened the somewhat romantic colouring of his thoughts, and the splendid imagery of his style, he will nobly maintain the high name and honors of his revolutionary parent.

James Meline, of New-York, acquitted himself

in a manner surpassing all expectation, and above the need of praise that such a notice can bestow. Marcus Curtius was the subject of the poem that he pronounced, and which, we were given to understand, was altered from some original less adapted to declamation. For full and perfect expression in voice, in look, and gesture of the most varied feelings, this young gentleman stood evidently pre-eminent. His command of the passion of his hearers was proved by the deep attention, the suppressed breathing, and the absolute stillness of the whole assembly. There was an instant when the entire audience was completely electrified by his vivid representation of Curtius rushing into the awful gulph. Every head was involuntarily raised and bent forward, as if to catch the last sight of the self-devoted hero. I observed with regard to this young gentleman, that besides several honours for success in the classic department, he obtained the premium, not only for elocution, but also for knowledge of history, knowledge of the theory of music and the projection of maps. And we had in the course of the day as satisfactory evidence of his proficiency in the two last accomplishments, as in that of speaking. Another remarkable instance of varied talents was afforded by Joseph Precios' pronouncing an eulogium on Columbus, in the Spanish tongue; but with such eloquence of voice and countenance, and such grace of action, as to win the attention even of those who did not understand the language in which he spoke. Francis Higgins, of Norfolk, who had just been honoured with the degree of A. B. closed the interesting display with an address on the decline and revival of letters, well written, teeming with erudition, and rich in classic allusions. There were passages also in his valedictory, above the ordinary tone of similar addresses. To exemplify this I quote, as nearly in his own words as I can remember, the manner in which he introduced and applied the lines of Persius, to his preceptor Cornutus.—

"The last echo of my voice," said he, "shall soon have died away in this hall; the last glittering of St. Mary's steeple shall have disappeared, and the blue outline of her mountain have faded from my view; yet the calm still voice of remembrance will often, often whisper to me of my mountain companions, and I shall often feel a melancholy joy in repeating, while fancy recalls some known voice of familiar countenance."—

Tecum etenim longos memini consumere soles  
Et tecum primas epulis decerpere noctes  
Unum opus et requiem pariter disponimus ambo

Before and after the distribution of premiums and the conferring of degrees, and in the intervals between the addresses, our ears were delighted with exquisite strains of music by the Collegiate Amateurs. The compositions performed were generally *overtures* by the great masters of musical science, as Mozart, Rossini, &c., and the pleasure which I enjoyed was equalled by the astonishment at the high degree of perfection to which this delightful accomplishment is cultivated by these interesting youths. For this great credit is undoubtedly due to their

talented and scientific musical preceptor, Mr. Andry; and to all their professors and teachers great credit for their evident proficiency in so many departments. But it appears to me, (and every thing I saw was calculated to strengthen the impression,) that an enthusiastic love of excellence in every branch of study—a spirit of honourable emulation constantly sustained, and the advantages of a situation retired from every distracting object and occasion—must be taken into the estimate, along with the native talents of the students, and the skill and unremitting care of their instructors, to account for their extraordinary proficiency and varied merit displayed on this day.

I believe that every one, who like me, witnessed this commencement at Mount St. Mary's College, Emmetsburgh, came away feeling a deep interest in its welfare, and breathing an ardent prayer for its permanent prosperity.

A FRIEND TO SCIENCE.

### ORIGINAL.

#### RELIGIOUS SWINDLING.

This may be truly designated the age of religious swindling. The villany began in England; the most speculating Country of any in Commercial enterprise carried on by joint stock companies, and partnerships, to a prodigious extent, in every possible way of acquiring wealth; though all this in a mercantile sense; or, where value is tendered for value received, may be strictly honest, honorable and praise worthy. But, in this same country we find another set of speculating jobbers, not so blamelessly intent on bettering their temporal circumstances: those evidently alluded to by the chief Apostle, who, *through covetousness, with feigned speeches, make merchandize of you.* 2 Pet. 2, 3. These are our *Tract and Bible mongers*: a set of hypocritical sharpers; who, some thirty years ago, were shrewd enough to perceive that in the protestant's high-prized *rule of faith*, the dead letter of the scripture, or the *printed Bible*; they could originate a most lucrative speculation; and one, which could not but be cherished, supported, and promoted by the zealous members of all protestant sects; whose common principle it is to reject the authoritative interpretation of the Church, Matt. 18 17, and abide every one by his own opinion.

The bait took—The Protestant public of every denomination gave headlong into the snare laid for them. Subscriptions and donations, came pouring in from every quarter to the inventors of this press made paper Apostleship. Advertisements in all the public journals; and placards posted up in all frequented situations, did for them, in their Bible traffic, what such had done for a Solomon in the sale of his incomparable nostrum, his all surpassing *balm of Gilead*.—This, in a word, was the hopeful origin of that mock evangelizing delusion, so craftily grounded on the vital principle of universal Protestantism; a thing struck up to raise the wind by a fundless firm; now known as the *Bible-society*. To preclude all suspicion of misapplica-

tion of the cash contributed towards the support and furtherance of this printer's bubble, early care was taken by its interested inventors to solicit and get ingrafted into their *trax*, not the persons but the names of the most illustrious and high-titled individuals in the land. These they incessantly trumpeted forth as the approving patrons of their pious proceedings: nominal partners in the undertaking; not such as would trouble themselves in the cash details: whose coveted meed was *praise*, not *pay*; with which they were supposed abounding, some droppings of which they would rather let fall into the treasury, as a further inducement to the blazing forth of their fame. Between these and the former, *pay and puff* was the order of the day. The party, however, more immediately concerned in this nefarious speculation thus effectually screened their villainy from the public mistrust. For who could ever suspect dishonesty in those, whose scheme was sanctioned, lauded, supported and promoted by all the great and learned, whom Protestantism could boast of? Yet look in the *pro forma* statements of this joint stock, bible-making, money begging company, at the enormous sums annually received by them from their well meaning dupes of every protestant persuasion: and then ask yourself, (in the absence of all informers, but the very receivers) what becomes of all this *gratis* growing treasure; augmented vastly as it is besides by the extensive sale (amounting to at least nine tenths) of their ten times paid-for printed bibles? This much we can tell the much imposed on protestant public, (for Catholics are placed beyond the delusion; having purer Biblical versions of their own, and the *Church*, assigned by Christ, as their sole and sure expounder, Matt. 18, 17,) this we can assure the dupes of their bible quacks, that of the millions of Bibles, reported as sent out yearly for distribution to foreign countries; not so many thousands, (and these too for sale, wherever they can be so disposed of) are ever actually exported. In our seaports there are agents appointed to receive and forward, as directed, their tract and Bible packages; containing what numbers the senders choose to specify. These are merely identified but never counted over at the custom house: and a *bona fide* certificate is returned to the directing party; which is carefully registred at their office, as proof positive of the corresponding outlay with the reported income. We have been assured, in a way not to doubt the fact, that in Liverpool one of these trusty agents, was in the habit, after passing his packages at the custom house, of embarking them in his boat, as if to be shipped on board some outward bound vessel in the offing, and then of sinking them as spoiled teas, or stores, in some unfrequented part of the river Mersey. The export ticket however proved to demonstration that his pious cargoes were duly forwarded to their places of destination. Should any wish to be more particularly informed as to the swindling tricks and traffic of the Bible society; let them read, we think in the Edinburgh Review, the disputes between the Scotch and English Bible Societies, for and against the publication of the *Apocrypha*, and there they will

see how the cat was let out of the bag, in this un-  
guarded eagerness of the contending parties.

To be continued.

**THE CATHOLIC.**—The Catholic at Kingston, has been fit to be seriously offended with the Sentinel on account of the remarks of one of his correspondents respecting the popish doctrine, of the celibacy of the clergy, and has vented his indignation, not by showing that the word of God prohibits the marriage of the clergy, (for he knows that that word commands it as a general rule,) but by reviling the Church of England and her Scriptural services.

To set the departure of the Church of Rome from the word of God in this matter in a clear light, we here subjoin a few passages of Scripture. "And when Jesus was come into Peter's house, he saw his wife's mother laid, and sick of a fever." Mat. viii. 14. It is more than probable that St. John was a married man: for we find in John xix. 27, that he took the mother of our Lord to his own home. It is almost certain that the greater number of the Apostles were married men, as may appear by 1 Cor. ix. 5. "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the brethren of our Lord, and Cephas?" or Peter.—*The rest of the Apostles, or the remaining Apostles,* is more literally after the Greek.—Here Paul asserts two things: 1. His Christian liberty to marry if he, as an individual, deemed it expedient. 2. That in so doing he would only conform to the common practice of the holy apostles. In Timothy iii. he says: "A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife—one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in all subjection.—Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well." Then immediately following in the next chapter, he delivers a most remarkable prophecy of the anti-scriptural policy of papal Rome on this very point. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter days some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils: speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron: forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth." So it is perfectly in character that the Catholic should return railing and abuse instead of attempting to vindicate by the Bible such gross corruptions of the word of God. Men do not in general appeal for justification to those witnesses whom they dare not meet face to face.

The Sentinel feels a little curious to know why his neighbour the Catholic has maintained such profound silence in regard to an article on Papal Supremacy which appeared in his paper, No. 32, of April 5th. That article gives a complete refutation of the Popish dogmas of Supremacy, Infallibility and Tradition; and what is a little singular, it does it on the sure warrant of Scripture and the history of the primitive Church, and in perfect accor-

dance with the legal sense and meaning of some grounds of argument laid down by Dr. Milner in his end of religious controversy. The Sentinel makes bold to request of the Catholic, that he will be kind enough to point out the particular defects in that piece of "the lowest methodistic abuse of that Church, from which his [the Sentinel's] own derives all she has to boast of Christian Doctrine, or priestly dignity." He conceives this the more incumbent on the Catholic, because the dogma of papal Supremacy is the key to the controversy between us and the Church of Rome. And he can at present, assign no cause for the long silence of the Catholic on that plain appeal to scripture and the early history of the Catholic Church, except it be a consciousness of the total absurdity of the claims of the Bishop of the Diocese of Rome to that supremacy of which he so long has boasted.

Christian Sentinel.

*Sed, tacitus pasci si posset corvus; haberet  
Plus dapis; et rixâ multo minus, invidioque.*—Hor.

**THE SENTINEL** boasts with a flourish of his pen, to have set, in this matter, the departure of the Church of Rome from the word of God in a clear light: and, in an article of his paper, No. 32, April 8, (which, like many others of his Numbers, has never reached us,) to have given a COMPLETE REFUTATION of the popish dogmas of supremacy, infallibility and tradition; and this too on the sure warrant of scripture, and the history of the primitive church!!!—Well done, *Three River Sentinel!* Thine, indeed, is a stupendous achievement! With a single dash of thy matchless pen, thou hast laid prostrate in the dust, the popish broad and lofty fabric of eighteen hundred years standing!!!—What was a Sampson's exploit to this? He but killed a thousand Philistines with the jaw bone of an Ass; but thou (and that certes in time of need,) hast dispatched at once, and in a trice, some thousand millions of the enemy with but a slightly brandished goose quill!!!

Well now, let us first see, on the Sentinel's own showing, how clearly he has set the Church of Rome from the word of God in the matter of celibacy: though, indeed it was not an over Godly act of him, to have done so. Peter, he proves from Scripture, had a wife! who ever denied it? But let him prove next from scripture, if he can, that Peter cohabited with his wife, after he had become the Apostle. His next clear proof is an absurd and ambiguous surmise; in one sense so revolting to every Christian's feeling, that I really shudder to transcribe it. It is, says he, more than probable that Saint John was a married man: for we read that he took the mother of our Lord to his own home, John, 19, 27. Can he mean that St. John took her to his wife, whom the Saviour had recommended to him as his Mother?—Ye Church of England followers, one and all; how do you like this Scriptural surmise of your admired oracle? And do not his words most clearly bear this meaning? But his words, though not so clearly, bear another sense, *He (St. John) took the mother of our Lord to his own home.* Therefore, concludes the Sentinel, *It is more than probable that St. John was a married man.* Did he, who can argue thus, ever stu-

dy dialectic's? Must every one having a home of his own, be therefore accounted a married man? Besides, the word home is a parliamentary, and hence a legal addition to the sacred text. The early fathers of the Church, with whose writings, the Sentinel seems wholly unacquainted, infer the very contrary of his profane conjecture from the scripture text alluded to: affirming that the virgin son made over his virgin mother to St. John, his beloved disciple, just because he was a virgin.

It is almost certain, continues he, (then it is not quite so,) that the greater number of the Apostles were married men, as may appear by 1. Cor. 9, 5, (he should have said from: but Granmer here is not the question,) and of this text he will have us swallow, without a wince, his purposely falsified english Translation, which is as follows: *have we not power to lead about a sister, A WIFE, as well as other Apostles; and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas!* The English reformers, to sanction their uxorious propensities, translate here *Gunaika* in the Greek text, which signifies a woman; as if it were *Akoiten*, a married woman, or *Stochos*, a wife. In the ancient Latin version also, we read, not *Uxorem* a wife, but *Mulierem*, a woman. By this cunning shift, and almost imperceptible substitution, they sought to assume to themselves, in the eyes of their ignorant dupes, a scripture right to lug about with them, wherever they went, not sisters, but wives and children: because the Apostles, to avoid too frequent intercourse with female Neophytes, may have allowed some devout and charitable women occasionally to follow them; dispensing their alms to the indigent; and pious initiative counsel to those of their own sex.

But the odd fancy of the man to rank St. Paul among those claiming a right to carry about with him a wife, &c., the one who declares himself unmarried, and who so exalts the state of celibacy, or virginity, above the matrimonial one, 1, Cor. ch. 7, verses 7, 8, 26, 27, 32, 33, 34, 35.

We cannot sufficiently wonder at the supreme ignorance of antiquity betrayed by this mouth piece of Episcopacy, in citing from Timothy 3, the words of the same Apostle to prove marriage an indispensable requisite in Bishops and Deacons.—*A Bishop then must be blameless; the husband of one wife, one that ruleth well his own wife, having his children in all subjection.* Let the Deacons be the husbands of one wife; ruling their children, and their own houses well. We presume the Sentinel himself is not without these scriptural appendages of his ministry; for we know he says, that the marriage of the Clergy is commanded by the word of God, as a general rule. He seems then not to know what the History of the primitive Church will teach him, that the Apostle's words were always understood to imply, not a command to be the husband of one wife, and a carnal parent, but a prohibition to ordain any as Bishops or Deacons, who had been more than once married. For in the infancy of the christian church it was not easy to recruit from the Jewish or Heathen world a virgin priesthood, like that alluded to by the prophet Isaias, ch. 56, ver. 4, 5. But this much we



know from the records of the primitive Christian Church, that such husbands of one wife as were ordained Bishops or Deacons, observed invariably afterwards a life of continency.

The *Sentinel* next cites on this point what he is pleased to call a most remarkable prophecy of the ANTI-SCRIPTURAL POLICY OF PAPAL ROME. Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter days some shall, (a prodigious some) depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron: forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them who believe and know the truth, 1. Tim. 4.

Is it then the doctrine of devils, what the same holy apostle, (whose words are just cited,) so clearly teaches and practices: as we have seen above? 1 Cor. 7 &c. Is it the doctrine of devils to fast and abstain from certain meats, that which we find in scripture so often prescribed by God himself; and practised by the most holy of his servants; nay, even by the God incarnate; and sincere by his followers, the real children of the bridegroom? Was the apostolic and scriptural prohibition to eat blood and strangled meats, the doctrine of the devils? Or, does the *Sentinel* discard it, as such, when eating against the scriptural injunction his strangled capon and blood pudding? Can we really suppose this doughty divine so wholly a stranger to church history, as not to know what is acknowledged by all, except the merest bible spelling, and religious tract taught simpletons, that the apostle's prophecy just quoted, regarded only the abominable Manichean heresy; which taught that there were two supreme principles, or gods; a good, and an evil one, which prohibited marriage as instituted by the evil principle, and commanded to abstain from certain meats, such as flesh, wine &c. as created by their evil god. This is truly the doctrine of devils: and we must say that nothing but that low; untaught methodical, and bigotted spirit, which the *Sentinel* betrays on all occasions in his stile and subject matter, could have ever induced him to apply his prophecy to the Catholic church: that church, which more than his, or any other protestant one, exalts the state of marriage to the dignity of a sacrament; which commands no abstinence from meat, as unclean in themselves; or as not created to be received with thanksgiving; but merely to train her children to repair by their obedience that original disobedience which wrought our woe, by eating that which God had prohibited: to conquer their animal appetites, and thus subdue the flesh to the spirit: to punish ourselves for our sinful excesses; and prevent our relapsing into them; like the same holy apostle, whose words are so cited against his own very practice; he who chastized his body, and brought it under subjection, lest, while he preached to others, he should become himself a castaway.

We might well have spared ourselves the trouble of making these remarks on the *Sentinel's* all surpassing article composed against us; by referring him to those numbers of our paper, which treat of

celibacy; and which he certainly has never read: otherwise he never would have ventured to put forth on the subject so poor and pitiless a performance as the present one. We suspect he now feels that, instead of setting as he says he has done, the departure of the Church of Rome from the word of God in a clear light: he has only afforded us the opportunity of setting his own departure from it in a clearer light than he probably anticipated. We have not seen his boasted article on papal supremacy; but knowing all the poor stuff that all his betters have urged against it, we shall take up the subject at a venture; and prove it too without much difficulty, on the sure warrant of scripture, and the history of the primitive church. And now, we would bid him look at our motto, as we presume he understands it; and if he has but the wisdom to profit by it, he should thank us for our friendly hints.

Alas! alas! After glancing at his children's department, of the 5th inst. we find we have been all along along tilting at a block.

EDITOR.

AU PUBLIC.

Les psaumes, aux quels nous voila arrives dans le cours de nos explications Bibliques, etant une portion si importante et interessante de l'ecriture Sainte; nous voudrions en presenter a nos lecteurs un commentaire plus choisi et etudie; ce que, pour le moment, nous ne pourrions realiser a notre pleine et entiere satisfaction. En cessant donc pour un temps, de continuer nos explications de la Bible, nous esperons pouvoir avec avantage les recommencer dans notre second volume; s'il paroit que nous puissions hazarder la continuation de notre periodique: ce qui depend de l'exactitude avec laquelle les abonnements sont remis au publieur. Can, quelque disposes que nous soyons a dedier nos veilles gratis et sans retour icibas, a l'instruction publique, et a la defence de la religion: nous ne nous trouvons pas a meme de souffrir une si grande perte annuelle en supplant le defaut des paiements a l'Imprimeur, au fournisseur, et a la poste, pour la publication la moins dispendieuse qu'on puisse nommer.

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

THE Psalms, at which we are now arrived in our *Biblical Notices and explanations*, are so important and interesting a portion of the inspired writings; that we could wish to give a more choice & studied commentary upon them, than we can well at present accomplish. We must therefore suspend for a while our scriptural notes; which we intend renewing in our second volume: should we be induced to continue the publication. This, however, entirely depends on the exactness, with which the subscriptions are remitted to the publisher; for, though willing to yield, as we have hitherto done, even single handed, our labours GRATIS to the public in the cause of truth; we cannot afford to be at so very considerable a yearly loss, to make up the defalcation of payments to the Printer of the cheapest periodical in existence.

THE EDITOR.

IGNORANCE AND THE VICES.

A M. S. POEM.

And since; in ev'ry age, in ev'ry place,  
What countless millions of our frenzied race  
Has horrid war unthine; swept away,

Continued.

And blended, sudden mould'ring, with the clay:  
All in full manhood's vigor late who trod,  
Urg'd to their death at some fierce despot's nod.

No quarrels individual these incite:  
But (worse than brutal far, and monstrous quite.)  
Against their brethren hateless they can speed  
The deadly shaft; and, theirs receiving, bleed.  
Who sees not here some preternat'ral ill?  
Such madness sole some demon could instil.  
Th' arch fiend, our envid bliss who seeks to spoil,  
Bids thus his agents dread our world embroil.

The ruthless chief, whom France her leader chose  
Whose sway so long disturb'd the world's repose;  
With thirst of pow'r, as boundless as the world,  
Defiance 'gainst each scepter'd rival hurl'd,  
Then pour'd his legions forth; an endless train;  
And left unpeopled half his vast domain,  
Peaceless, as a whirlwind on he pass'd;  
And all was level laid before the blast.  
The haughtiest monarchs fly, or prostrate fall;  
And tame submit to his degrading thrall.  
All, but the king of freedom's happy isle:  
He at the upstart's threats alone could smile:  
None could check the ruffian's wild career,  
And bid the trembling nations cease to fear.  
Yet ere the despot's murderous course was sped;  
And Britain him, her captive proud survey'd;  
What havoc had his dire ambition spread,  
Among friends and foes. All number'd with the dead,  
Mid fire and smoke; and war's astounding roar;  
And dying groans: and floods of reeking gore;  
He, like a furious fiend, with baleful breath,  
Was urging seen his followers on to death.

Is all this frantic madness human?—No.  
'Tis hellish quite; & excited by man's foe.  
The fiend, impatient to secure his prey,  
This game set up, that sweeps our race away.

THE CATHOLIC.

Will be published weekly at the Office of the Patriot and Farmer's Monitor, Kingston, Upper Canada, and issued on Friday. Terms—\$2 per annum (exclusive of postage, which is four shillings a year payable in advance

All Communications to be addressed to the Editors of the Catholic, Kingston, and Post Patriot.

Agents.

- Mr. Bergen, Merchant. . . . . York.
- Mr. Macan. . . . . Do. . . . . Niagara.
- Mr. L. O'Brien. . . . . Town of London.
- Rev Mr. Crowley. . . . . Peterboro.
- Rev. Mr. Brennan. . . . . Belleville.
- Mr. MacFalk. . . . . Wellington.
- Patriot Office. . . . . Kingston.
- Rev J. Macdonald. . . . . Perth.
- Mr. Hugh O'Beime. . . . . Yarmouth, near St. Thomas.
- Mr. J. A. Murdoch, P. M. . . . . Laxark.
- Alexander McMillan, Esq. . . . . Prescott.
- Mr. Tench Merchant. . . . . Mariatown.
- Rev. Wm. Fraser. . . . . Saint Andrews & Cornwall.
- Mr. Cassidy, Student, St. Raphael's. . . . . Glangary.
- Angus McDonell, Esq. P. M. Alexandria. . . . . Ditto.
- Col J. P. Leprehon, Compt. of Customs. . . . . Coteau du Lac.
- Mr. Moriarty. . . . . Schoolmaster at the Recollets, Montreal.
- Hon. James Cuthbert. . . . . Manorhouse, Bertier.
- Mr. Jon. Byrne. . . . . Lower Town Quebec.
- Rev. Mr. Canusky. . . . . New York.
- Rev. Dr. Purcell. . . . . President of St. Mary's College [ Emmet's Burgh, Maryland.
- Mr. Michael Fitzgerald. . . . . Augusta, Georgia.